



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

# Human Papillomavirus Research Where Should We Place Our Bets

### Citation for published version:

Cuschieri, K, Lorincz, A & Nedjai, B 2019, 'Human Papillomavirus Research Where Should We Place Our Bets', *Acta cytologica*, vol. 63, no. 2, pp. 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000493800>

### Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1159/000493800](https://doi.org/10.1159/000493800)

### Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

### Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

### Published In:

*Acta cytologica*

### General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# HPV Research: Where Should We Place Our Bets

Kate Cuschieri<sup>1</sup>, Attila Lorincz<sup>2\*</sup>, Belinda Nedjai<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Scottish HPV Reference Laboratory, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine, Centre for Cancer Prevention, Queen Mary University of London, Barts & the London School of Medicine, London, UK

Short Title: HPV Research Priorities and associated challenges

\*Corresponding Author

Full name: Prof Attila Lorincz<sup>2</sup>

Institute: Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine

Department: Centre for Cancer Prevention

University/Hospital: Queen Mary University of London

Street Name & Number: Charterhouse Square,  
City, State, Postal code, Country: London EC1M 6BQ, UK

Tel: +44(0) 20 7882 3540

E-mail: a.lorincz@qmul.ac.uk

Keywords: HPV Research Priorities Survey

## **Abstract**

### **Background**

Massive strides have been made with respect to primary and secondary prevention of HPV-associated disease as a result of prophylactic vaccination and cervical screening based on molecular HPV testing. However, cervical cancer continues to be an important clinical and societal burden. Additionally, other HPV-associated cancers for which there are no screening programmes are rising. Finally, the optimal combination of vaccination and screening strategies will require careful thinking. Considering this unprecedented and important time, we were keen to solicit the views of the expert community to determine what they perceived were the key priorities for HPV research. Our objective was to identify consensus and key priorities for HPV-based research through provision of a questionnaire disseminated to a multidisciplinary group of key opinion leaders (KOLs)

### **Summary**

A structured survey composed of 46 HPV research “categories” was sent to 73 KOLs who were invited to “rank” the categories according to priority. The invitees represented clinical and public health disciplines as well as basic scientists. Scores were weighted according to the number of responses. Invitees also had the opportunity to comment on barriers to the research and suggest other research areas that required attention not reflected in the survey.

We received 29 responses in total; overall, the 3 highest ranked categories were “optimal cervical screening in low and middle-income countries (LMIC)”, “primary disease prevention in LMIC” and “impact of vaccine on HPV infection and associated disease”. “HPV and the microbiome” and “mechanisms of transformation” were the highest ranked categories with

respect to basic research. Consistent barriers to research were around governance on the use of samples and data and funding, particularly in an era of vaccination.

### **Key Messages**

Research to support the management of disease in LMIC is clearly perceived as a priority in the international community in addition to other diverse areas which necessitate an improved basic understanding of viral mechanisms and interactions. International, multi-disciplinary efforts which articulate the broader HPV research agenda will be important when seeking funding in addition to international endeavours to support the efficient use of existing samples and cohorts to facilitate such research.

## Introduction

Unquestionably, this is an important and almost unprecedented time for HPV-based research. Decades of ground-breaking work starting with the demonstration of a transmissible agent that could cause warts, led to the confirmation that certain carcinogenic (high risk) HPV types can cause cervical cancer.<sup>1-3</sup> More recently the research has translated into global primary and secondary disease prevention strategies, which increasingly depend on HPV-based vaccination and testing.<sup>4</sup> In synch with such developments, laboratory technology/ies have advanced dramatically; molecular detection strategies have ostensibly replaced “direct morphology-based identification” and themselves have evolved from straightforward detection of single target(s) via PCR into next generation platforms with massive resolving power that can rapidly detect whole viral genomes and sequence the host genome which HPV occupy.<sup>5,6</sup>

Are we nearing the end of the road for HPV research? Have we made all reasonable endeavours to address this area and should we focus our resolve and energies on alternatives, particularly now that we are seeing the impact of vaccination on such scale? We would argue otherwise. Unfortunately, cervical cancer still continues to be a major clinical and societal burden, particularly in low and middle-income countries.<sup>7</sup> Additionally other HPV-associated cancers for which there are no screening programmes are rising, including but not confined to oropharyngeal cancer.<sup>8,9</sup> We don't have a clear idea about mechanisms of HPV persistence versus clearance and the precise molecular details of how certain hrHPV types can lead to cancer, sometimes in a short timeframe. Relatively little is known about the specific genetic and epigenetic mutations that underpin the evolution of CIN3, nor exactly which steps have a required sequence that then further facilitate the transformation of CIN3 to malignancy.<sup>10,11</sup> In addition, the optimal combination of vaccination and screening strategies will require agile thinking so that the value and efficiency of both can be realised in a time where shifting patterns of infection and disease will be the norm.

## A survey to help define the key priorities for HPV research for the next 5-10 years

Rather than simply stating “more work/research is needed” one of the aims of this piece was to try to identify priorities for HPV research going forward in the next 5 to 10 years at this

crucial time. To inform this we constructed a structured survey composed of 46 HPV research “categories” (Figure 1) which was sent to key opinion leaders (KOLs) who were invited to “rank” the categories according to what they perceived as a priority; with 1 being highest and 10 being lowest priority. The invitees represented various professions as summarised in Figure 2. Invitees were also offered the opportunity to comment on what they considered could be barriers/issues to the research and were also given the opportunity to suggest other research areas that required attention which were either not included or adequately reflected in the survey-wording.

### Dissemination

The initial survey was first sent to a “pilot” panel of individuals representing the above disciplines. The pilot panel offered key feedback/suggestions, which informed subsequent dissemination of a finalised questionnaire to 73 KOLs.

### Response(s) to research questionnaire

We received a total of 29 responses; 25 of the surveys were utilisable for scoring and the remainder were used descriptively for specific comments.

We received responses from all 7 of the “disciplines” described earlier although those from epidemiologists, clinicians (particularly gynaecology) and basic virology were the most represented. The majority of responses were from KOL based in North, South or Central America or Europe. Responses from those with particular expertise in conducting research in low to middle-income countries (LMIC) were also obtained.

Of the 46 categories in the survey we present those that were ranked as the first 15. Arguably, the first 15 categories can be grouped in to three themes (1) cervical screening (represented in yellow) (2) vaccination (in green) (3) basic science and biobanking (in blue) (Figure 3). In the subsequent sections we discuss priorities in relation to said themes

As not all responders added a score to each category, scores were weighted according to the number of responses.

## Cervical Screening

The category considered the highest research priority was “*Optimal cervical screening in LMIC*” although it was of interest that two further categories based on cervical screening research ranked within the top 5: “*Optimal cervical screening in high-income countries (HIC)*” & “*Optimal screening strategies for vaccinated women*”.

Other top 15 categories related to screening included: “*self-sampling to support cervical screening and disease management*”, “*improving equity of access in cervical screening*” and “*QA and metrics for HPV-based screening*”

With respect to the “top” priority a general barrier to delivery was inevitably “funding” in addition to responses that modelling studies will continue to be of value given the practical challenges of performing active research. It is beyond the scope of the present manuscript to consider all of the potential options for LMIC particularly given that one solution will clearly not “fit” all needs. However one issue that will require careful consideration is the optimal combination of vaccination and screening with this representing a challenge for all settings. The aspiration of the HPV FASTER endeavour/group is based on the proposal of extending HPV vaccination programmes to women up to age 30 years (and potentially up to 50 in certain settings) in addition to at least one HPV-based screening test in women aged 30 or more.<sup>12</sup> Various modelling studies based on actual and anticipated reduction in viral and disease prevalence have converged on the conclusion that cervical screening of immunised women may involve 2-3 visits in a lifetime.<sup>13-15</sup> The Australian COMPASS trial will represent the first RCT of HPV primary screening vs cytology in a population that includes females with high vaccine uptake rates.<sup>16</sup> While these conclusions will be of undoubted and timely value to the international community, how easily the observations may be extrapolated and transcribed may be more challenging given: (1) the significant variability in cytology performance between and within countries, (2) the potential impact of HPV primary screening assay choice, and (3) immediate and subsequent triage strategies which again vary widely according to programme.<sup>17</sup> Thus, requirement for country-specific evaluation projects which take into account mixed populations of immunised and un-immunised women may be justified. Such projects are also likely to benefit from the incorporation of modern technologies related to sample taking and laboratory testing.

Self-sampling based on the dissemination of postal testing kits which contain swabs for the self-collection of exfoliated vaginal samples, has been introduced in certain settings, including at the programme level.<sup>18,19</sup> Self-sampling has largely been directed to women who

default from regular screening invitations.<sup>20,21</sup> Such work speaks to “*addressing/improving equity of access in cervical screening*”. Certainly, the speed of development of self-sampling devices has accelerated considerably over the last 5 years as has the consideration of urine as a credible biospecimen for HPV testing.<sup>22-24</sup>

There are fewer studies that have directly addressed the performance of self-sampling in those who do attend for cervical screening.<sup>25</sup> Given the accelerated progress in objective molecular triage strategies (see later), which could obviate the requirement to visit a clinic, this is arguably an under-researched area both with respect to attitudinal research and “wet”, cohort studies or trials. Hurdles identified by the KOLs to delivering this type of research include engagement and buy-in from the gynaecological community given that it may “reduce their income”. This “gynae scepticism” as one KOL put it may be particularly marked in settings with opportunistic screening programmes. Further work to quantify the extent of this scepticism (and its drivers) may be of value and help determine what level and type of evidence would be required to effect actual change.

Regarding “*biomarkers for risk stratification and triage of HPV infection*” the perceived significant appetite for these in the international community has been borne out by the present survey. However in terms of application, of the countries which have implemented HPV primary screening programmes (or pilots), the triage strategies imposed have involved cytology (with or without adjunctive staining), limited genotyping or a combination of both.<sup>17</sup> These strategies do not provide a binary (yes/no) answer that allow “triage” negative women to be returned to routine screening. Additionally triage strategies based on morphology and limited typing will be less practicable and efficacious given challenges around retention of cytology workforce and the impact of vaccination which will reduce the PPV of both approaches.<sup>26,27</sup> Further work to develop and apply objective triage tests that do not require subjective interpretation and are unaffected by immunisation are warranted. The most evidenced candidate(s) are assays that are based on viral and/or cellular methylation. Methylation testing may be an effective triage tool to detect and characterize women at high risk of developing CIN3. The effectiveness of such tests in predicting CIN3 may influence the screening process in many ways, for example by providing an objective method to reach more accurate prognoses or by helping to avoid overtreatment of women with non-progressive lesions.<sup>28-31</sup>



When considering *quality assurance and metrics for HPV-based screening*, this is a very translational aspect but one that does require attention. The frequently cited guidelines of Meijer et al 2009 have been invaluable for the benchmarking of HPV DNA tests that are suitable for cervical screening.<sup>32</sup> However the guidelines are nearly 10 years old and omit certain elements that would be required for contemporary screening practices such as consideration (and relevant validation) of genotyping tests, biomarker tests, self-sampling and the influence of vaccination. Other key aspects of quality monitoring must incorporate performance of the test and subsequent management algorithms relative to significant disease within a programme, according to the accepted standards/key performance indicators. Again as the pattern and extent of disease changes in countries where vaccination has embedded, these performance indicators may well need to adapt. Suggested barriers to this type of research included “getting the health care services to understand that QA is important” and issues around the accuracy/comprehensiveness of relevant data-sources, access therein and governance, which again may be more challenging in opportunistic programmes.

## **Vaccination**

*“Primary disease prevention in LMIC via prophylactic vaccination (including 1 dose schedules)”* was the second highest rated of the categories/priorities described and is in line with the highest rated category *“optimal cervical screening in LMIC”*. The reality that 80% of cervical cancers are diagnosed in LMIC explains this observation. Twelve years ago, when a number of HIC were introducing HPV vaccine programmes there was a vanishingly small number of LMICs that were doing the same, largely due to cost of the vaccine which may have been compounded by the Global Alliance on Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI, which supports funding of childhood vaccination programmes in LMIC) not committing resources until 2011.<sup>33-35</sup> In 2018, the situation is more encouraging; a greater number of LMICs now have HPV demonstration projects or programmes and the “73 Decade of Vaccines” countries are projected to deliver HPV vaccine programmes in the period between 2015-30. The endorsement of multi-cohort vaccination of 9-14 year old girls in LMIC by WHO could also maximise benefits. Previously, single age cohort administration was the *modus operandi* for LMIC, usually at the lower end of the age indication (9-10 years). However accumulated evidence, including that derived from modelling work, indicates that multi-cohort vaccination could bring about a reduction in cervical cancer deaths at a greater rate, as recently described.<sup>36</sup> The utility of 1-dose schedules has also been demonstrated in *post-hoc* evaluations of the vaccine trials and in disaggregated data from national

programmes (where available) although efficacy has been largely shown for viral rather than disease endpoints.<sup>37</sup> The recent set-up of prospective randomised controlled trials which will directly address the effectiveness of reduced dose schedules will be of clear value and is likely to influence decision making given the cost and logistical savings.<sup>38,39</sup> This is relevant when we considered the respondents issues to barriers around vaccination which included “funding”, “governance” and “competing priorities”.

It was also notable that “impact of vaccine on HPV infection and associated disease” was considered a top-5 priority, irrespective of setting. While considerable data are now available which have shown a significant impact on a variety of different outcome measures (infection, warts, herd immunity, clinical activity)<sup>40-42</sup> we still await data to demonstrate impact on cancer and also direct evidence from mixed dosing trials (where different vaccines have been used in schedules of >1 dose). The demonstration of vaccine efficacy links to “*management and mitigation of perceived vaccine safety issues*”. Arguably such demonstration (including in LMICs) is key to supporting positive and evidence-based messages around the benefits to harms ratio of the vaccines. The republic of Ireland experienced a significant drop in uptake (from around 87% in 2014 to ~50% in 2016/17) after heavyweight anti-vaccine lobbying, although recent evidence indicates that rates are now recovering.<sup>43</sup> However, this was after significant effort and explicit government support which included the creation of the HPV Vaccination Alliance, a group of approximately 35 separate diverse organisations including, women's rights, child welfare and various health organisations, all committed to raising awareness of HPV vaccination. The experience in Ireland and indeed elsewhere (including Denmark, Romania and Japan)<sup>44-46</sup> shows how rapidly successful campaigns can founder and strengthens the case for applied high-quality research that “*explores barriers to vaccine participation*”. Consistent feedback from KOLs on the hurdles of delivering such information was based around the challenges and governance of gaining access to unvaccinated females (in various settings) with whom to conduct qualitative research. A further interesting comment was that for traction, the results of such studies required “acceptance by biologic scientists and physicians of results and implementation plans”.

Determination of vaccine effectiveness includes gaining a greater understanding of “*immunogenicity and long term protection*” in order to inform pragmatic strategies/schedules going forward and to support key educational messages to best engage the public. However, consistent with feedback, ease of delivery will vary according to setting. Countries with centralised cancer registries and national cervical screening databases where accurate immunisation data can be linked (with due process of governance) to other relevant health-

care data sets are in the minority including in HIC. Potentially, the creation of “international databases” (to quote from one KOL) that could be “used to determine health disparities” and determine differential impacts on particular ethnic and societal groups would be of value. Like many other categories, research exploring the impact of and barriers to vaccination was perceived to be hampered by lack of funding. While industry has played a crucial part in supporting and funding long term efficacy and safety trials, the conflict that this presents, particularly to the anti-vaccine community can limit and subvert the conclusions of these studies. One responder indicated that “*Ideally studies must remain absolutely free of conflicts to assure trustworthiness*”.

Therapeutic vaccination was also included in the first 15 categories. While clearly of value there is to-date no licensed therapeutic vaccine or anti-viral that carries a specific indication for HPV-associated disease. Therapeutic vaccines may be based on live vectors, protein/peptide, whole cell(s) or nucleic acid. An increasing number of vaccines have now reached clinical trial/and application, most prominently for nucleic acid based vaccines. Encouraging results in phase 2 clinical trials have been observed in patients with HPV16 and HPV18 associated CIN and also in vulval disease.<sup>47</sup> In addition to the generation of new candidate therapeutic vaccines and assessment of their efficacy in trials, several strategies that could enhance vaccine effect require investigation. Such strategies need to include improvement in the uptake and presentation of HPV antigens in dendritic cells.<sup>48,49</sup> Furthermore, optimal use of a vaccine in combination with other therapies including chemo-radio therapy and immunological adjuvants is an area that would benefit from additional research and is consistent with the general endeavour in health care to deliver personalised/stratified management for patients.<sup>47,50,51</sup> There was a relatively small amount of feedback related to challenges around delivering research to develop this particular field although two respondents indicated the importance of performing basic science to understand and define the key immunological effectors of disease regression, as well as robust clinical trials. These comments are consistent with those articulated in an excellent review of therapeutic vaccines by Cheng et al (2018) who stated that “ a deeper knowledge of the tumor micro-environments also holds great potential for improving therapeutic vaccines”<sup>47</sup>

## BASIC SCIENCE AND BIOBANKING

The aspect of basic science relating to HPV which was considered the highest priority was *molecular and cellular biology – transformation*. Key effectors and players critical to transformation process are challenging to trial in patient settings as threshold for treatment is generally CIN2+, a heterogeneous lesion, the majority of which will regress and as discussed more than half of CIN3 (a greater proxy of significant disease) will regress.<sup>52</sup> Models to study HPV infection and transformation are clearly important, thus the development and access to such models are crucial to understanding basic mechanisms key to viral life-cycle and transformation, in addition to helping to determine the influence of external agents/therapeutics. The development and enhancement of model systems was identified as a missing priority area in the survey. Creating such models is challenging as HPV is obligated to complete its life cycle in human differentiated epithelium which is clearly complex to recreate. The most established models involve the culture of HPV-infected keratinocytes, directly derived from a human lesion (eg W12) or transfected artificially (eg NIKS) in organotypic raft cultures. Raft cultures enable epithelial differentiation to be recapitulated at least to an extent in vitro.<sup>53,54</sup> These systems have been used extensively although with a bias to those infected with HPV16 and HPV18.

Animal models arguably offer a more holistic system in which to monitor infection and disease) longitudinally, particularly given the natural history of lesion development which can take several years and the fundamental influence of immune responses. The cottontail rabbit papillomavirus and the rabbit oral papillomavirus have yielded important discoveries including insights into the features/hallmarks of viral latency and how this links to clinical manifestations.<sup>54</sup> The mouse papillomavirus (MmuPV) has also been used recently to study the influence of immunological factors on HPV infection and associated lesions and transgenic models of disease have provided insights into the influence of external factors such as hormones and UV irradiation on disease.<sup>55</sup> Compared to models of cervical disease models of other HPV-associated cancers are rarer and less established. Given the increase of non-cervical cancers, this is an area that requires attention as was pointed out by a survey responder

The influence of the microbiome on a diverse range of health outcomes including physical and mental health has been one of the most fertile and interesting areas of microbiological research in the last decade. In relation to HPV infection, data indicate that diversity in the vaginal mucosa is independently associated with a lower risk of disease progression; whereas

a reduced relative component of lactobacilli and domination of strict-anaerobes is associated with worse outcomes.<sup>56,57</sup> Lactobacilli support an acidic vaginal environment and studies, including large population-based series, have indicated that low vaginal pH (<5) is associated with a lower risk of HPV positivity. Additionally, Motevaseli et al (2013) showed that lactobacilli can exert a cytotoxic effect on Hela cells (cancer cell line driven by HPV18) independent of lactate and also pH, an effect not observed in a “normal” un-infected epithelial cell line, suggesting that other factors in addition to pH may add protective characteristics of lactobacilli.<sup>58</sup> Such observations have been reinforced by more recent work which demonstrated the inhibitory effect of lactobacilli supernatants on CaSki cells (a cancer cell line which contains HPV16). This work has brought about consideration of pro-biotic and pre-biotic preparations to modify the vaginal microbiota; the future application of these ideas in trial settings will provide essential clinical data as to the effectiveness of the approach. The bulk of studies which have assessed the influence of the wider microbiological context and HPV have focussed on the vagina and implications for cervical disease. There are relatively few data that have looked at the microbiome to determine its potential influence on other HPV-associated cancers including OPC. This may well be an area that deserves increased attention given that small, proof of concept studies indicate that the composition of the salivary microbiome may reflect discrete clinical and aetiological states.<sup>60</sup> Few issues with respect to microbiome were raised by KOLs other than a call to define the term “microbiome” in a bid for accuracy and consistency and to make between study comparison more robust.

*“Access to samples and optimal bio-banking for the future”* was identified as a priority area and fundamentally well-annotated biobanks with access to clinical data, will support the various research priorities discussed above. Issues raised included: “maintenance” and “costs”. Additionally, storage and manipulation of routinely taken clinical samples to deliver research that demands high quality RNA can be challenging. Consequently, research which supports the enhancement of sample stability and maximal yield and quality of derivatives is important to make the best use of biobanks in the future. International sharing of best practice and protocols will also be of value in achieving this.

Ensuring appropriate and robust governance is in place is also absolutely essential and it can take time to identify and secure the relevant permissions, particularly as there are generally a number of entities who must be engaged with in addition to the research ethical committee. As the set-up of biobanks requires considerable infrastructure, core funding to support this

even for a fixed period is of help. Thereafter, revenue can be generated as a function of requests for access to samples. While this can help sustain archives, it is not generally sufficient for complete maintenance, particularly as the frequency and nature of requests cannot be accurately predicted. Complimentary funding from grants is often required as well as core funding from national resources. One issue raised with respect to the latter is the potential lack of “political awareness” of the requirement for biobanks. Basic and applied studies would benefit from access to well-annotated samples from the cervical screening programmes with long term follow-up information which would allow an accurate evaluation of new markers and associated interventions. Another added benefit of access to such samples/information would be the potential to link to records that allow the influence of the marker/modality under study on a variety of HPV-related (or putatively related) cancers. Certainly given the increase in self-sampling in the current screening programmes, biobanks that contain a heterogeneity of both clinician and self-taken samples would be valuable including those from studies where matched samples (clinician vs self) have been collected. International efforts to support both hard protocols (specimen manipulation) and soft protocols (linkage & governance considerations) for prospective biobanking could be game changing with respect to the speed of how new developments are assessed and implemented.<sup>61</sup>

### Additional Areas for Research

Table 2 summarises the additional comments we received from responders (n=7) as to “other suggestions for the future”. These areas were perceived as either absent from the original questionnaire, or not covered explicitly enough. A total of 14 suggestions were articulated; 3 related to screening, 6 vaccination and 5 addressed to basic science/biobanking. Regarding screening, two of the three comments, again, described the requirement to deliver research that would support improvements in LMICs. The final comment related to a screening test for oropharyngeal cancer and this indeed reconciles with the significant global increase in oropharyngeal cancer in the last decade.<sup>8</sup> An “early warning” test for what can be a highly morbid disease is clearly worth consideration, however, one of the challenges around this is the nature of the intervention in view of a positive test, given that there is no clear precursor phase for OPSCC.

The additional comments on vaccination talk to some of the earlier discussion around the requirement for more readily affordable vaccines and associated dosing schedules to support

use in LMICs, as does the delivery of research to improve vaccination rates by focussing on behavioural interventions. Research into the use of vaccine for broader/off label indications was also suggested by two separate responders including for “older “age groups and for those potentially at greater risk of disease including those previously treated for HG CIN, men who have sex with men and “under-screened” populations. Arguably some of these research proposals have already translated into implementation for example, in the UK a targeted vaccination programme for MSMs was piloted initially in 2016 with full implementation in place in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. Furthermore, vaccination of older age groups is consistent with the ethos of HPV FASTER, as described earlier.<sup>12</sup> Any potential therapeutic benefit of the prophylactic vaccine would benefit from further comprehensive research as current evidence is relatively ambiguous and largely based on single-arm, small observational trials. The comments on additional developments for basic science spoke to the requirement for specific sample sets to be accommodated in bio-banks and the use of models, including models of non-cervical disease to support the identification and assessment of new therapies.

#### Concluding remarks

Research on HPV has exerted a significant global impact on the burden of infection and disease in addition to providing insight into key mechanistic processes fundamental for lesion and cancer development that have a broader reach.

The multi-disciplinary nature of research to-date has undoubtedly contributed to these outcomes. While we have argued that requirement for further HPV research is essential to improve morbidity, globally how to address funding constraints will be an inevitable challenge. An interesting refrain from a number of responders was that strategically, funders may be less inclined to fund HPV research given the availability and success of vaccine– this was perhaps articulated perhaps most succinctly by the comment that “the funding crunch is to some extent a reflection of our own success.” The case for continued funding for HPV based research requires concerted support from the international community to ensure it does not slip from the agenda and so that opportunities for successful collaborations are identified. Such collaborations may not just be confined to practical project but also exercises that make the most of existing sample and data sets. While there are clear governance constraints and processes that are required to permit this, said processes should balance the potential harms to benefits so not to preclude or significantly delay relevant contemporary research that will

directly inform the next stage of service improvement. As one responder put it “Arguably, HPV research has been one of the most successful areas in medicine and public health” –now we must be careful not to drop the ball or to throw obstacles in its path.

Finally, while we happily acknowledge the theme of this issue, to contextualise the developments in HPV research with respect to geological timescales is challenging given that within the three million year quartererernary period, the time of humankind, is too diminutive to be visible! However, if we refine our perspective to the Jurassic age perhaps we should reflect that the “dinosaur renaissance”, a revolution which started in the late 1960s, inspired concerted and renewed interest in dinosaurs within academia and popular culture after sight of evidence which indicated dinosaurs may have been warm blooded, intelligent active animals, rather than plodding cold-bloods as had been the earlier consensus. Said renaissance brought about a seismic shift in thinking on all fundamental aspects of dinosaur biology. Researchers of a certain vintage take heart (!) and positive ownership of the dinosaur epithet to exert your warm blooded intelligent active selves to meet the challenges of the new epoch in HPV research.

### **7.1. Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the following individuals for their welcome and expert contributions Alex Castanon, Andrew Macdonald, Barbara Moscicki, Christopher Crum, Cosette Wheeler, David Mesher, Diane Harper, Eduardo Franco, Francesca Carozzi, Gary Clifford, Gina Ogilvie, Laurie Smith, Gregory Zimmet, Hans Berkhof, Iain Morgan, Jesper Bonde, Joe Monsonogo, Jo Waller, Jose Jeronimo, Kate Soldan, Kevin Pollock, Lawrence Banks, Luisa Villa, Marc Arbyn, Matejka Rebolj, Paul Lambert, Pekka Niemenen, Peter Hillemans, Sheila Graham and Sylvia Franceschi.



## 7.2. Statement of Ethics

Not applicable review article

## 7.3. Disclosure Statement

**KC (non personal).** KCs institution has received funding for research or consumables to support research from the following in the last 3 years Qiagen, Hologic, Selfscreen, GeneFirst, Euroimmun, Cepheid, Genomica, LifeRiver

**AL** No conflict of interest

**BN** No conflict of interest

## 7.4. Funding Sources

Not applicable review article

## 7.5. Author Contributions

KC – Involved in survey construction and initial testing, survey dissemination, response collation and manuscript preparation and refinement

AL - Involved in survey construction and manuscript preparation, refinement and ultimate review

BN - Involved in survey construction and initial testing, survey dissemination, response collation and manuscript preparation and refinement

## REFERENCES

1: Gissmann L, Boshart M, Dürst M, Ikenberg H, Wagner D, zur Hausen H. Presence of human papillomavirus in genital tumors. J Invest Dermatol. 1984 Jul;83 (1Suppl):26s-28s.

2: Syrjänen KJ, Syrjänen SM. Human papilloma virus (HPV) infections related to cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN) and squamous cell carcinoma of the uterine cervix. Ann Clin Res. 1985;17(2):45-56.

3: Gissmann L. Human papillomaviruses and genital cancer. Semin Cancer Biol. 1992 Oct;3(5):253-61. R

4: zur Hausen H. Papillomaviruses in the causation of human cancers - a brief historical account. *Virology*. 2009 Feb 20;384(2):260-5.

.

5: Poljak M, Kocjan BJ, Oštrbenk A, Seme K. Commercially available molecular tests for human papillomaviruses (HPV): 2015 update. *J Clin Virol*. 2016 Mar;76 Suppl 1:S3-S13.

6: Mirabello L, Clarke MA, Nelson CW, Dean M, Wentzensen N, Yeager M, Cullen M, Boland JF; NCI HPV Workshop, Schiffman M, Burk RD. The Intersection of HPV Epidemiology, Genomics and Mechanistic Studies of HPV-Mediated Carcinogenesis. *Viruses*. 2018 Feb 13;10(2). pii: E80.

7: Mezei AK, Armstrong HL, Pedersen HN, Campos NG, Mitchell SM, Sekikubo M, Byamugisha JK, Kim JJ, Bryan S, Ogilvie GS. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer screening methods in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Int J Cancer*. 2017 Aug 1;141(3):437-446.

8: Hussein AA, Helder MN, de Visscher JG, Leemans CR, Braakhuis BJ, de Vet HCW, Forouzanfar T. Global incidence of oral and oropharynx cancer in patients younger than 45 years versus older patients: A systematic review. *Eur J Cancer*. 2017 Sep;82:115-127.

9: Carlander AF, Grønhøj Larsen C, Jensen DH, Garnæs E, Kiss K, Andersen L, Olsen CH, Franzmann M, Høgdall E, Kjær SK, Norrild B, Specht L, Andersen E, van Overeem Hansen T, Nielsen FC, von Buchwald C. Continuing rise in oropharyngeal cancer in a high HPV prevalence area: A Danish population-based study from 2011 to 2014. *Eur J Cancer*. 2017 Jan;70:75-82.

10: Nedjai B, Reuter C, Ahmad A, Banwait R, Warman R, Carton J, Boer S, Cuzick J, Lorincz AT. Molecular progression to cervical precancer, epigenetic switch or sequential model? *Int J Cancer*. 2018 Apr 21. doi: 10.1002/ijc.31549. [Epub ahead of print]

11: Kriek JM, Jaumdally SZ, Masson L, Little F, Mbulawa Z, Gumbi PP, Barnabas SL, Moodley J, Denny L, Coetzee D, Williamson AL, Passmore JA. Female genital tract

inflammation, HIV co-infection and persistent mucosal Human Papillomavirus (HPV) infections. *Virology*. 2016 Jun;493:247-54.

12: Bosch FX, Robles C, Díaz M, Arbyn M, Baussano I, Clavel C, Ronco G, Dillner J, Lehtinen M, Petry KU, Poljak M, Kjaer SK, Meijer CJ, Garland SM, Salmerón J, Castellsagué X, Bruni L, de Sanjosé S, Cuzick J. HPV-FASTER: broadening the scope for prevention of HPV-related cancer. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2016 Feb;13(2):119-32.

13: Landy R, Windridge P, Gillman MS, Sasieni PD. What cervical screening is appropriate for women who have been vaccinated against high risk HPV? A simulation study. *Int J Cancer*. 2018 Feb 15;142(4):709-718.

14: Pedersen K, Burger EA, Nygård M, Kristiansen IS, Kim JJ. Adapting cervical cancer screening for women vaccinated against human papillomavirus infections: The value of stratifying guidelines. *Eur J Cancer*. 2018 Mar;91:68-75.

15: Canfell K. Cervical screening in HPV-vaccinated populations. *Climacteric*. 2018 Jun;21(3):227-234.

16; Canfell K, Saville M, Caruana M, Gebiski V, Darlington-Brown J, Brotherton J, Heley S, Castle PE. Protocol for Compass: a randomised controlled trial of primary HPV testing versus cytology screening for cervical cancer in HPV-unvaccinated and vaccinated women aged 25-69 years living in Australia. *BMJ Open*. 2018 Jan 26;8(1):e016700. Erratum in: *BMJ Open*. 2018 Mar 8;8(3):e016700corr1.

17: Cuschieri K, Ronco G, Lorincz A, Smith L, Ogilvie G, Mirabello L, Carozzi F, Cubie H, Wentzensen N, Snijders P, Arbyn M, Monsonogo J, Franceschi S. Eurogin roadmap 2017: Triage strategies for the management of HPV-positive women in cervical screening programs. *Int J Cancer*. 2018 Aug 15;143(4):735-745.

18: Lam JU, Rebolj M, Møller Ejegod D, Pedersen H, Rygaard C, Lynge E, Thirstrup Thomsen L, Krüger Kjaer S, Bonde J. Human papillomavirus self-sampling for screening nonattenders: Opt-in pilot implementation with electronic communication platforms. *Int J Cancer*. 2017 May 15;140(10):2212-2219.

- 19: Enerly E, Bonde J, Schee K, Pedersen H, Lönnberg S, Nygård M. Self-Sampling for Human Papillomavirus Testing among Non-Attendees Increases Attendance to the Norwegian Cervical Cancer Screening Programme. PLoS One. 2016 Apr 13;11(4):e0151978.
- 20: Verdoodt F, Jentschke M, Hillemanns P, Racey CS, Snijders PJ, Arbyn M. Reaching women who do not participate in the regular cervical cancer screening programme by offering self-sampling kits: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised trials. Eur J Cancer. 2015 Nov;51(16):2375-85.
- 21: Lim AW, Hollingworth A, Kalwij S, Curran G, Sasieni P. Offering self-sampling to cervical screening non-attendees in primary care. J Med Screen. 2017 Mar;24(1):43-49.
- 22: Pathak N, Dodds J, Zamora J, Khan K. Accuracy of urinary human papillomavirus testing for presence of cervical HPV: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ. 2014 Sep 16;349:g5264.
- 23: Van Keer S, Tjalma WAA, Pattyn J, Biesmans S, Pieters Z, Van Ostade X, Ieven M, Van Damme P, Vorsters A. Human papillomavirus genotype and viral load agreement between paired first-void urine and clinician-collected cervical samples. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2018 May;37(5):859-869.
- 24: Leinonen MK, Schee K, Jonassen CM, Lie AK, Nystrand CF, Rangberg A, Furre IE, Johansson MJ, Tropé A, Sjøborg KD, Castle PE, Nygård M. Safety and acceptability of human papillomavirus testing of self-collected specimens: A methodologic study of the impact of collection devices and HPV assays on sensitivity for cervical cancer and high-grade lesions. J Clin Virol. 2018 Feb - Mar;99-100:22-30.
- 25: Stanczuk G, Baxter G, Currie H, Lawrence J, Cuschieri K, Wilson A, Arbyn M. Clinical validation of hrHPV testing on vaginal and urine self-samples in primary cervical screening (cross-sectional results from the Papillomavirus Dumfries and Galloway-PaVDaG study). BMJ Open. 2016 Apr 25;6(4):e010660.
- 26: Palmer TJ, McFadden M, Pollock KG, Kavanagh K, Cuschieri K, Cruickshank M,

Cotton S, Nicoll S, Robertson C. HPV immunisation and cervical screening--confirmation of changed performance of cytology as a screening test in immunised women: a retrospective population-based cohort study. *Br J Cancer*. 2016 Mar 1;114(5):582-9.

.

27: Bhatia R, Kavanagh K, Cubie HA, Serrano I, Wennington H, Hopkins M, Pan J, Pollock KG, Palmer TJ, Cuschieri K. Use of HPV testing for cervical screening in vaccinated women--Insights from the SHEVa (Scottish HPV Prevalence in Vaccinated Women) study. *Int J Cancer*. 2016 Jun 15;138(12):2922-31.

28: De Strooper LMA, Berkhof J, Steenbergen RDM, Lissenberg-Witte BI, Snijders PJF, Meijer CJLM, Heideman DAM. Cervical cancer risk in HPV-positive women after a negative FAM19A4/mir124-2 methylation test: A post hoc analysis in the POBASCAM trial with 14 year follow-up. *Int J Cancer*. 2018 Sep 15;143(6):1541-1548.

29: Lorincz AT. Virtues and Weaknesses of DNA Methylation as a Test for Cervical Cancer Prevention. *Acta Cytol*. 2016;60(6):501-512. Epub 2016 Nov 3.

30: Kelly H, Chikandiwa A, Warman R, Segondy M, Sawadogo B, Vasiljevic N, Didelot MN, Meda N, Weiss HA, Delany-Moretlwe S, Mayaud P, Lorincz A. Associations of human gene EPB41L3 DNA methylation and cervical intraepithelial neoplasia in women living with HIV-1 in Africa. *AIDS*. 2018 Jul 12.

.

31: Luttmer R, De Strooper LM, Dijkstra MG, Berkhof J, Snijders PJ, Steenbergen RD, van Kemenade FJ, Rozendaal L, Helmerhorst TJ, Verheijen RH, Ter Harmsel WA, van Baal WM, Graziosi PG, Quint WG, Spruijt JW, van Dijken DK, Heideman DA, Meijer CJ. FAM19A4 methylation analysis in self-samples compared with cervical scrapes for detecting cervical (pre)cancer in HPV-positive women. *Br J Cancer*. 2016 Aug 23;115(5):579-87.

32: Meijer CJ, Berkhof J, Castle PE, Hesselink AT, Franco EL, Ronco G, Arbyn M, Bosch FX, Cuzick J, Dillner J, Heideman DA, Snijders PJ. Guidelines for human papillomavirus DNA test requirements for primary cervical cancer screening in women 30 years and older. *Int J Cancer*. 2009 Feb 1;124(3):516-20.

- 33: Gallagher KE, LaMontagne DS, Watson-Jones D. Status of HPV vaccine introduction and barriers to country uptake. *Vaccine*. 2018 Aug 6;36(32 Pt A):4761-4767.
- 34: Sabeena S, Bhat PV, Kamath V, Arunkumar G. Global human papilloma virus vaccine implementation: An update. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res*. 2018 Jun;44(6):989-997.
- 35: Harper DM, DeMars LR. HPV vaccines - A review of the first decade. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2017 Jul;146(1):196-204. Erratum in: *Gynecol Oncol*. 2017 Nov;147(2):489.
- 36: Jit M, Brisson M. Potential lives saved in 73 countries by adopting multi-cohort vaccination of 9-14-year-old girls against human papillomavirus. *Int J Cancer*. 2018 Jul 15;143(2):317-323.
- 37: Kreimer AR, Struyf F, Del Rosario-Raymundo MR, Hildesheim A, Skinner SR, Wacholder S, Garland SM, Herrero R, David MP, Wheeler CM; Costa Rica Vaccine Trial Study Group Authors, González P, Jiménez S, Lowy DR, Pinto LA, Porras C, Rodriguez AC, Safaeian M, Schiffman M, Schiller JT, Schussler J, Sherman ME; PATRICIA Study Group Authors, Bosch FX, Castellsague X, Chatterjee A, Chow SN, Descamps D, Diaz-Mitoma F, Dubin G, Germar MJ, Harper DM, Lewis DJ, Limson G, Naud P, Peters K, Poppe WA, Ramjattan B, Romanowski B, Salmeron J, Schwarz TF, Teixeira JC, Tjalma WA; HPV PATRICIA Principal Investigators/Co-Principal Investigator Collaborators; GSK Vaccines Clinical Study Support Group. Efficacy of fewer than three doses of an HPV-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine: combined analysis of data from the Costa Rica Vaccine and PATRICIA Trials. *Lancet Oncol*. 2015 Jul;16(7):775-86
- 38: Sampson JN, Hildesheim A, Herrero R, Gonzalez P, Kreimer AR, Gail MH. Design and statistical considerations for studies evaluating the efficacy of a single dose of the human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine. *Contemp Clin Trials*. 2018 May;68:35-44.
- 39: Franceschi S, Clifford GM, Baussano I. Options for design of real-world impact studies of single-dose vaccine schedules. *Vaccine*. 2018 Aug 6;36(32 Pt A):4816-4822.

- 40: Kavanagh K, Pollock KG, Cuschieri K, Palmer T, Cameron RL, Watt C, Bhatia R, Moore C, Cubie H, Cruickshank M, Robertson C. Changes in the prevalence of human papillomavirus following a national bivalent human papillomavirus vaccination programme in Scotland: a 7-year cross-sectional study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2017 Dec;17(12):1293-1302.
- 41: Korostil IA, Ali H, Guy RJ, Donovan B, Law MG, Regan DG. Near elimination of genital warts in Australia predicted with extension of human papillomavirus vaccination to males. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2013 Nov;40(11):833-5.
- 42: Cruickshank ME, Pan J, Cotton SC, Kavanagh K, Robertson C, Cuschieri K, Cubie H, Palmer T, Pollock KG. Reduction in colposcopy workload and associated clinical activity following human papillomavirus (HPV) catch-up vaccination programme in Scotland: an ecological study. *BJOG*. 2017 Aug;124(9):1386-1393.
- 43: Corcoran B, Clarke A, Barrett T. Rapid response to HPV vaccination crisis in Ireland. *Lancet*. 2018 May 26;391(10135):2103.
- 44: Maier C, Maier T, Neagu CE, Vlădăreanu R. Romanian adolescents' knowledge and attitudes towards human papillomavirus infection and prophylactic vaccination. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2015 Dec;195:77-82.
- 45: Suragh TA, Lamprianou S, MacDonald NE, Loharikar AR, Balakrishnan MR, Benes O, Hyde TB, McNeil MM. Cluster anxiety-related adverse events following immunization (AEFI): An assessment of reports detected in social media and those identified using an online search engine. *Vaccine*. 2018 Aug 29. pii: S0264-410X(18)31203-9. [Epub ahead of print]
- 46: Hanley SJ, Yoshioka E, Ito Y, Kishi R. HPV vaccination crisis in Japan. *Lancet*. 2015 Jun 27;385(9987):2571Erratum in: *Lancet*. 2015 Jul 18;386(9990):248.
- 47: Cheng MA, Farmer E, Huang C, Lin J, Hung CF, Wu TC. Therapeutic DNA Vaccines for Human Papillomavirus and Associated Diseases. *Hum Gene Ther*. 2018 Mar 16. [Epub ahead of print]

48: Galliverti G, Tichet M, Domingos-Pereira S, Hauert S, Nardelli-Haeffliger D, Swartz MA, Hanahan D, Wullschlegel S. Nanoparticle conjugation of human papillomavirus 16 E7-long peptides enhances therapeutic vaccine efficacy against solid tumors in mice. *Cancer Immunol Res.* 2018 Aug 21. pii: canimm.0166.2018. Epub ahead of print]

49: Ilyinskii PO, Kovalev GI, O'Neil CP, Roy CJ, Michaud AM, Drefs NM, Pechenkin MA, Fu FN, Johnston LPM, Ovchinnikov DA, Kishimoto TK. Synthetic vaccine particles for durable cytolytic T lymphocyte responses and anti-tumor immunotherapy. *PLoS One.* 2018 Jun 1;13(6):e0197694.

50: Cordeiro MN, De Lima RCP, Paolini F, Melo ARDS, Campos APF, Venuti A, De Freitas AC. Current research into novel therapeutic vaccines against cervical cancer. *Expert Rev Anticancer Ther.* 2018 Apr;18(4):365-376.

51: Li J, Chen S, Ge J, Lu F, Ren S, Zhao Z, Pu X, Chen X, Sun J, Gu Y. A novel therapeutic vaccine composed of a rearranged human papillomavirus type 16 E6/E7 fusion protein and Fms-like tyrosine kinase-3 ligand induces CD8(+) T cell responses and antitumor effect. *Vaccine.* 2017 Nov 7;35(47):6459-6467.

52: Tainio K, Athanasiou A, Tikkinen KAO, Aaltonen R, Cárdenas J, Hernández, Glazer-Livson S, Jakobsson M, Joronen K, Kiviharju M, Louvanto K, Oksjoki S, Tähtinen R, Virtanen S, Nieminen P, Kyrgiou M, Kalliala I. Clinical course of untreated cervical intraepithelial neoplasia grade 2 under active surveillance: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2018 Feb 27;360:k499.

53: Christensen ND, Budgeon LR, Cladel NM, Hu J. Recent advances in preclinical model systems for papillomaviruses. *Virus Res.* 2017 Mar 2;231:108-118.

54: Doorbar J. Model systems of human papillomavirus-associated disease. *J Pathol.* 2016 Jan;238(2):166-79.



- 55: Cladel NM, Budgeon LR, Balogh KK, Cooper TK, Hu J, Christensen ND. A novel pre-clinical murine model to study the life cycle and progression of cervical and anal papillomavirus infections. *PLoS One*. 2015 Mar 24;10(3):e0120128.
- 56: Kyrgiou M, Mitra A, Moscicki AB. Does the vaginal microbiota play a role in the development of cervical cancer? *Transl Res*. 2017 Jan;179:168-182.
- 57: Zhang C, Liu Y, Gao W, Pan Y, Gao Y, Shen J, Xiong H. The direct and indirect association of cervical microbiota with the risk of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia. *Cancer Med*. 2018 May;7(5):2172-2179.
- 58: Motevaseli E, Shirzad M, Akrami SM, Mousavi AS, Mirsalehian A, Modarressi MH. Normal and tumour cervical cells respond differently to vaginal lactobacilli, independent of pH and lactate. *J Med Microbiol*. 2013 Jul;62(Pt 7):1065-72.
- 59: Wang KD, Xu DJ, Wang BY, Yan DH, Lv Z, Su JR. Inhibitory Effect of Vaginal Lactobacillus Supernatants on Cervical Cancer Cells. *Probiotics Antimicrob Proteins*. 2018 Jun;10(2):236-242.
- 60: Wolf A, Moissl-Eichinger C, Perras A, Koskinen K, Tomazic PV, Thurnher D. The salivary microbiome as an indicator of carcinogenesis in patients with oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma: A pilot study. *Sci Rep*. 2017 Jul 19;7(1):5867.
- 61: Samuels S, Balint B, von der Leyen H, Hupé P, de Koning L, Kamoun C, Luscap-Rondof W, Wittkop U, Bagrintseva K, Popovic M, Kereszt A, Berns E, Kenter GG, Jordanova ES, Kamal M, Scholl S. Precision medicine in cancer: challenges and recommendations from an EU-funded cervical cancer biobanking study. *Br J Cancer*. 2016 Dec 6;115(12):1575-1583.

## **List of Figures**

Figure 1: Full questionnaire sent to key opinion leaders.

Figure 2: Professional “groupings” of the KOLs who responded to the survey.

Figure 3: The main three research “themes” identified as priorities for development (1) cervical screening (represented in yellow) (2) vaccination (in green) (3) basic science and biobanking (in blue)